DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 943 TM 030 196

AUTHOR Etsey, Y. Kafui
TITLE Teachers' and School Administrators' Perspectives and Use of Standardized Achievement Tests: A Review of Published Research.
PUB DATE 1997-03-00
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Tests; *Administrator Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; Literature Reviews; *Standardized Tests; *Teacher Attitudes; Teachers; *Test Use

ABSTRACT

Stakeholders and practitioners are concerned about the extent to which standardized achievement tests are meeting the general and specific purposes they were designed to achieve. Several empirical studies have been conducted to this end. This study reviews this research to determine current trends in teachers' and school administrators' perspectives and uses of standardized achievement tests. In the first step of this review, literature on teachers' and school administrators' perspectives and the uses of standardized tests was searched in the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) database. The second step was the selection of relevant studies. The final step involved reading and analyzing the full text of the studies. The review shows that the current attitude of classroom teachers toward standardized achievement tests appears to be negative, although administrators have more positive attitudes. Teachers use standardized achievement test results on a limited scale to make educational decisions, using the tests mainly to confirm or supplement the information they already have about their students. Administrators find standardized test results very useful, especially for curricular evaluation, communication with parents, and evaluation of school effectiveness. Recommendations for test use resulting from these findings include greater localization of state-mandated tests. School administrators should not use standardized tests to assess school effectiveness. Further studies of the perceptions and uses of standardized tests are needed. (Contains 162 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 434 943

Teachers' and School Administrators' Perspectives and Use of Standardized Achievement Tests: A review of published research.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Y. Kafui Etsey
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Y. Kafui Etsey

The University of Iowa, Iowa City

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Chicago, IL.
March 24-28, 1997

TM030196

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Standardized achievement testing occupies a central position in American education. It is a gigantic enterprise and confronts students at every level of education. It appears however that, over the past decades, the popularity and use of standardized tests, have been accompanied by changes in peoples' perceptions and uses of them. Stakeholders and practitioners are concerned about the extent to which standardized achievement tests are meeting the general and specific purposes they are designed to achieve. Several empirical studies have been conducted to this end. The current study reviews this research to determine current trends in teachers' and school administrators' perspectives and uses of standardized achievement tests.

Three steps were involved in this study. In the first step, literature on teachers' and school administrators' perspectives and use of standardized achievement tests was located through Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) data base, Dissertation Abstracts International (DAI) data base, and references cited in the searches identified through ERIC and DAI. The second step was the selection of the relevant studies. Thirty-seven studies were chosen. The final step involved reading and analysis of the full text of the studies which were found in journals and on microfiche.

The following conclusions were made.

1. Classroom teachers' current attitude toward standardized achievement tests appear to be negative.
2. School administrators appear to have a positive attitude toward standardized achievement tests.
3. Teachers' use standardized achievement test results on a limited scale to make educational decisions. The major use is to confirm or supplement what information they already have about their students.
4. School administrators' find standardized test results very useful. The major uses are for curricular evaluation, communication to parents, and evaluation of school effectiveness

Recommendations made included the following:

1. State-mandated tests need to be more localized. State departments of education should seriously consider implementing a central state curriculum which will make inter-school comparisons more effective.
2. School administrators should not use standardized test results to assess school effectiveness. Rresults from other assessment instruments must be combined with the standardized test results to assess the effectiveness of the school.
3. More large scale studies addressing the perceptions and uses of standardized achievement tests by school administrators are needed.
4. More research needs to be done on the effect of teacher attitude toward standardized achievement tests on students' performance.

Teachers' and School Administrators' Perspectives and Use of Standardized Achievement Tests: A review of published research

Introduction

Standardized achievement testing occupies a central position in American education. It is a gigantic enterprise and confronts students at every level of education. Over the past two decades, standardized achievement testing has become more frequent and popular. Barton (1994) viewed it as "an explosion in the United States over the past twenty years" (p. 2). By 1990, the National Commission on Testing and Public Policy estimated that each year, elementary and secondary students took 127 million separate tests as part of standardized test batteries mandated by states and districts (Madaus & Tan, 1993). Perrone (1991) reported that "few people who completed high school before 1950, for example, took more than three standardized tests in their entire school careers.....those who complete high school in 1991 will have taken, on average, from 18 to 21 standardized tests.....since 1950 the volume of testing has grown at the annual rate of 10-20 percent" (p. 133). State-mandated testing programs also rose from 1 in 1960 to 32 in 1985, and 46 in 1990 (OTA, 1992; Madaus & Tan, 1993).

Hathaway (1983) believed that "the quest to improve standards and accountability in the face of dwindling resources and support, the research on effective schools and classrooms, with its emphasis on clear, high academic expectations and prompt, accurate knowledge of results" (p. 1) are some of the forces that led to the increase in the volume of achievement testing. One of the major spurts however for this phenomenal growth in standardized achievement testing was the release of the 1983 document "A nation at Risk

-- the imperative for Educational Reform". Several reforms were initiated as a result of the studies following the release of the document. The reforms "all demanded improvement and increased efficiency in the public schools, with the public's concern couched under the broad umbrella of accountability" (Watson, 1990, p. 1). One consequence of these reforms is the development of and increase in the student testing programs at the state and school district levels (Odden, 1986).

Madaus & Tan (1993) also commented on the factors responsible for the growth of standardized achievement testing. They stated that the following four broad social forces help to explain the growth in achievement testing.

- Recurring public dissatisfaction with the quality of education in the United States and efforts to reform education.
- A broad shift in attention from focusing on the inputs or resources devoted to education toward emphasizing the outputs or results of our educational institutions.
- An array of legislation, at both federal and state levels, promoting or explicitly mandating standardized testing programs.
- Bureaucratization of education and schooling.

However, it appears that the tremendous increase in the popularity and use of standardized tests, has been accompanied by changes in their perceptions and uses. Initially, they were viewed and used as instructional tools and indicators of educational accomplishments (Baker, 1988; Watson, 1990). However, these perceptions and uses seemed to have changed and stakeholders and practitioners are concerned about the extent to which standardized achievement tests are meeting the general and specific purposes they are designed to achieve. Several empirical studies have been conducted to

this end. The current study reviews this research to determine current trends in teachers' and school administrators' perspectives and uses of standardized achievement tests.

More specifically, the purposes of this review are to:

1. determine the perceptions of classroom teachers toward standardized achievement tests.
2. determine the perceptions of school administrators toward standardized achievement tests.
3. ascertain the uses of standardized achievement test results by classroom teachers.
4. ascertain the uses of standardized achievement test results by school administrators.
5. provide an up-to-date bibliography on the perspectives and uses of standardized achievement tests by teachers and school administrators.

Limitations of the study

The original proposal was to use meta-analysis to study the gender and school level differences in classroom teachers' and school administrators' perspectives and use of standardized achievement tests. The studies located however did not provide enough statistical information to enable effect sizes to be computed. In addition, where statistics were available, the studies provided the same direction of effect. The traditional 'vote counting' approach, where the category with the highest 'vote' is used to represent the overall outcome, was used in the analysis. One weakness of the vote counting approach is that it tends "to make the wrong decision more often as the amount of evidence (number of studies) increases" (Hedges & Olkin, 1985, p. 52). The vote counting

approach is also problematic for sample sizes and effect sizes of the magnitudes often associated with educational research. For effect sizes which are less than 0.3 (common in educational research), the probability of detecting the effect by the vote-counting procedure decreases as the number of studies increases (Bradford, 1990). The major problem here is the accumulation of type II errors as the number of studies increases (Hedges & Olkin, 1980, 1985).

Another limitation of the study concerns the scope of the search. Other sources such as Psychological Abstracts (PA) were not used in the search due to time constraints.

Method

Three steps were involved in this study. In the first step, literature on teachers' and school administrators' perspectives and use of standardized achievement tests was located in three ways: (1) six key word and subject searches of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) data base was made with the following descriptors - *standardized tests, achievement tests, classroom teachers, school administrators, teacher attitudes, administrator attitudes,* (2) search of the Dissertation Abstracts International (DAI) data base, and (3) references cited in the searches identified through the ERIC and DAI.

The second step was the selection of the relevant studies. The following criteria was used.

1. Classroom teachers and/or school administrators in the United States were included as participants of the study.

2. The focus of the study was on perspectives, perceptions, attitudes, and/or uses of standardized achievement tests.
3. The study was undertaken between 1965 and 1996.

Thirty-eight studies were selected comprising of 16 researches on teachers' perspectives, two studies on school administrators perspectives, 16 on teachers' use of test results and four on school administrators' use of test results.

The final step involved the reading and the analysis of the full text of the studies which were found in journals and on microfiche.

Results

Perspectives of standardized tests

Several opinions have been expressed about standardized achievement tests. Ward (1980) reported that while "almost all involved in education have recognized the many limitations of current testing technology and the many abuses made of student testing, some have called for the severe curtailment or elimination of testing while others have favored reforms in the process" (p. 15). Herman and Dorr-Bremme (1983) stated that critics have decried the arbitrary nature of standardized tests and attacked them as biased. Further the tests have been accused of narrowing the curriculum (Baker, 1978; Perrone, 1978).

On the other hand, advocates of standardized testing have asserted that the current tests do serve a variety of important purposes. They believed that improved standardized achievement tests "promote accountability, facilitate accurate placement and selection

decisions, and yields information useful in improving curriculum and instruction" (Herman and Dorr-Bremme, 1983, p. 7). Teachers and school administrators are often concerned about the heated debates about the value of standardized achievement tests. The following review highlights their perspectives on standardized achievement tests in American schools.

Classroom teachers

Cormany (1974) conducted a study to 'measure teacher and counselor attitudes toward the standardized testing programs of their districts and to determine which demographic variables contributed most to the differences in their attitudes' (p. 9). He surveyed a sample of 45 public school districts in Pennsylvania using all school counselors (157) and a 10 percent random sample of all teachers. A total of 1,027 forms were analyzed. He found that in general, teachers showed a positive attitude toward standardized tests. He found further that men showed significantly more positive attitudes toward standardized testing than did women and secondary teachers had more positive attitudes than did elementary teachers.

Takeuchi (1977) studied 534 California K-6 elementary school teachers selected from 800 California schools. He administered a 26-item Faculty Attitudes toward Standardized Testing (FAST) Inventory. His results showed that teachers have a negative attitude toward standardized tests. Ninety-two percent (92%) of the teachers opposed the use of standardized tests in schools. Fifty-six percent of the teachers stated that they felt the time used for standardized testing could be better used for other kinds of

experiences. About 68% of the teachers felt that standardized tests provided little relevant information for teachers.

Ward (1980) mailed 800 survey instruments to a sample chosen systematically from the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) membership files to be representative of all AFT members in elementary and secondary schools. Two hundred and nine forms were returned which was a 26.1 percent return rate. The returned forms were made up of 46 percent elementary school (K-6) teachers and 45 percent secondary school (7-12) teachers and 7 percent who taught in both schools. He found that teachers seem to be generally supportive of standardized tests and want to improve standardized tests, not to eliminate them. This result however needs to be interpreted with caution because of the very low return rate. A response bias could influence the result.

One of the major studies was conducted by Stetz and Beck in 1981. They surveyed 3306 teachers who participated in the Spring 1978 standardization of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. They found that "teachers generally view standardized tests as one component of the ongoing instructional program - sometimes an important component, sometimes not; sometimes useful, sometimes not. They view test results with both limited respect and skepticism" (p. 10).

Lambert (1981) studied a national sample of 102 deans of teacher training institutions, 41 legislators and 34 American Federation of Teachers and National Education Association (AFT-NEA) officials. He reported that "when asked to characterize the general attitude of teachers toward standardized testing the most frequent

response from all three groups was 'negative, afraid of results, suspicious, a threat to job security'" (p. 14).

Edelman (1981) surveyed 150 third-grade teachers in 39 schools representing every geographic area in the Los Angeles Unified School District. One hundred and four completed questionnaires were returned. Fifty-four percent of the teachers had neutral attitudes toward standardized tests while 46 percent had negative attitudes.

Brophy (1982) conducted a state-wide survey of teachers, counselors, and administrators in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He sought to assess the attitudes and knowledge of the three groups regarding standardized tests in their respective communities. A total of 171 teachers, 139 counselors, and 151 administrators representing 27 Massachusetts communities comprised the sample. Of the total sample size, 77 percent completed the survey. He found that the attitudes of teachers was the least favorable among the three groups of educators.

Another notable study was done by Dorr-Bremme and Herman in 1986. They surveyed a nationwide sample of elementary and secondary principals and teachers through a successive random-selection procedure as to what they perceive/believe about achievement tests. Responses were obtained from 475 elementary school teachers and 114 high school teachers in 91 of the 114 districts sampled. Return rates were about 50 percent for high school teachers and about 60 percent for elementary school teachers. The results showed that teachers felt standardized tests generally cover what they teach but often fail to meet their practical need of providing feedback on student performance.

Although they (teachers) believed testing to be beneficial, they also felt that standardized tests were not uniformly fair in that not all tested material is covered in class.

In a study of 555 elementary school teachers in the state of Wyoming, Green and Stager (1986) found that teachers' attitudes toward standardized achievement tests tended to be indifferent or negative. No significant differences were found for attitudes toward standardized tests between male and female teachers. Though teachers' attitude toward standardized tests was negative, no significant differences were found as grade level taught increased.

Griswold's (1988) study was designed to "provide evidence of teachers' positions on testing to build a district philosophy and policy statement for the measurement of student achievement" (p. 8). Two hundred and twenty-nine questionnaires were sent to all district teachers (K-12) in the Parkrose School District in Portland, Oregon. Two hundred and twenty-one questionnaires were returned yielding a response rate of 92%. He found that teachers' criticized standardized achievement tests because they felt it does not follow the district curriculum. Their general attitude toward standardized testing was not favorable.

Green and Williams (1989) obtained two random samples of classroom teachers from Wyoming (n=555, 81% return rate) and Louisiana (n=253, 54% return rate) to determine teachers' purposes for using standardized tests, and attitude toward standardized testing. A 12-item likert type scale was used to assess attitudes toward testing and the uses of standardized tests. They reported that the overall "attitude toward

standardized tests tended to be neutral to negative, although teachers did perceive standardized tests as serving some useful purpose" (p. 15).

CRESST (1990) used a teacher questionnaire containing 131 items to survey 85 kindergarten through 12th grade teachers from a large urban school district. Fifty-five teachers were from elementary schools and 30 from secondary schools. On teachers attitudes towards testing, elementary school teachers especially those serving low SES schools generally did not believe that standardized testing helps schools to improve or clarify important learning goals, nor do they feel that it gives important feedback. Secondary teachers showed similar, though slightly less pessimistic views. While almost all felt that testing created tension for them and their students, the elementary school sample expressed stronger and more universally negative feelings.

Soltz (1991) surveyed third, fourth and sixth grade teachers who administered the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, (CTBS) and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). A total of 231 teachers were involved in the study but only 178 (77% return rate) completed and returned the survey. He reported that "viewed across the three grade levels involved, teachers expressed a range of responses. That is, these teachers did <u>not</u> react in ways that would suggest <u>consistently</u> negative feelings toward the tests (although there was a good deal of negative feelings expressed). Rather, their responses tended to spread across the range of options provided by the Likert scales" (p. 6-7).

Green (1992) mailed questionnaires to 700 teachers in a rural western state who were randomly selected from the State Department of Education list of all licensed

educators. A total of 555 questionnaires were received for a return rate of 81%. Results indicated that teachers were less favorable toward standardized tests.

Impara, Plake and Fager (1993), from an NCME-sponsored study, received responses from 555 teachers from 82 school systems in 42 states. The responses to the questionnaire indicated that most teachers are less inclined to feel standardized tests should be used as instructional tools.

Urdan and Paris (1994) studied 153 K-8 teachers who attended annual meetings of either the Michigan Reading Association or the International Reading Association. They used a survey instrument which included 101 items. They reported that "teachers had generally negative perceptions of standardized tests. Only 3% agreed that tests are generally good, whereas 77% felt that tests are not worth the time and money spent on them" (p. 145).

School administrators

Brophy (1982) conducted a state-wide survey of teachers, counselors, and administrators in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He sought to assess the attitudes and knowledge of the three groups regarding standardized tests in their respective communities. A total of 171 teachers, 139 counselors, and 151 administrators representing 27 Massachusetts communities comprise the sample. Of the total sample size, 77 % completed the survey. He found that the attitudes of administrators were more favorable toward standardized testing than that of teachers.

In the Dorr-Bremme and Herman (1986) study cited earlier, responses were obtained from 220 principals which was about 60% return rate. The principals indicated that testing was a central issue in their professional lives. They believed that standardized tests were fair to most students. On the whole, they (principals) in this study expressed the view that standardized tests were instruments that exerted a beneficial pressure on the teachers and on the principals as well. Two-thirds of the elementary school principals and three-fourths of the high school principals found that test-scores provided a good index of how the schools were doing.

The use of standardized achievement tests

Several articles and essays have been written about the potential uses of standardized tests. The major uses frequently listed are:

- diagnosing learning difficulties (Travers, 1979; Gronlund, 1981; Mehrens & Lehmann, 1984).
- detecting discrepancies between potential and achievement (Travers, 1979).
- selecting students for programs (Gronlund, 1981; Mehrens & Lehmann, 1984).
- assessing growth in academic achievement (Travers, 1979).
- grouping students for instruction (Travers, 1979).
- planning instructional activities (Travers, 1979; Gronlund, 1981; Mehrens & Lehmann, 1984).
- determining reasonable achievement levels in order to modify the curriculum (Travers, 1979; Gronlund, 1981; Mehrens & Lehmann, 1984).

- evaluate school district performance by comparing it to a national sample of other districts (Rudner, 1989).
- provide information about the success of various instructional programs in school district (Rudner, 1989; Weber, 1974).
- evaluate how students in school districts compare to their peers throughout the nation (Rudner, 1989).

The studies reviewed below highlight what the current usage is among teachers and school administrators.

Classroom teachers

Goslin's (1967) study of testing at the elementary and secondary school level represents one of the earliest most comprehensive work on teachers' use of standardized tests. The primary source of his data was "a questionnaire survey of 1,450 teachers in 75 public secondary schools selected according to quota sampling procedures to represent the universe of more than 21,000 public secondary schools in the united States" (p. 7). He reported that in elementary schools, teachers use test results primarily to diagnose individual difficulties and to provide information to the student. He also reported that teachers did not rely heavily on this source of information.

The Royal Oak (Michigan) Study (Boyd et al., 1975) supported the notion that teachers do not rely upon results of standardized tests for decision making. Although teachers reported that the results from the district-mandated testing program were used, there was little evidence that the testing program influenced school curriculum or

classroom instruction. They felt that standardized achievement test results supplied information about students' skills that were already known by them.

Bhaerman (1977) surveyed 66 teachers from both elementary and secondary schools who responded to 14 questions. To a question of how test scores are normally used in a district, the three most popular responses were (a) grouping and placing students (b) providing information for guidance (c) diagnosing learning problems.

In the Ward (1980) study, which has been cited earlier, "teachers in the survey felt that standardized test results were most useful for individual student placement and grouping for the diagnosis of individual student needs. On the other hand, they found test results least useful for modifying course content and evaluating instructional programs" (p. 26).

Anastasi (1980) used a School Personnel Inventory to survey 206 elementary school teachers and 1 junior high school teacher. Her sample was predominantly female (81%). The teachers rated standardized tests as useful and were used as an aid to understanding students, planning and adapting instruction, grouping students for instructional purposes, evaluating individual or group performances and identifying children with special needs.

Stetz and Beck (1981) reported from their study of 3,306 grade K-12 teachers that "overall about 10% make 'considerable' use of such (standardized tests) results and half make 'some' use of test data" (p. 6). The uses they found checked most frequently were for diagnosing strengths and weaknesses, measuring growth and individual student evaluation. In a study of 260 K-6 teachers representing 20 California elementary schools

in urban, rural, and suburban areas, Yeh, Herman and Rudner (1981), stated that fifty-eight percent of the elementary teachers surveyed reported that standardized test results were most important for initial reading placement, and sixty-six percent used test results most often for initial mathematics placement.

In another study, Salmon-Cox (1981) surveyed 68 elementary teachers in suburban and large school districts through interviews, observations at teachers' meetings and inservice workshops. About 50% of the teachers stated that standardized achievement tests are used only as a supplement to or confirmation of information they already possessed about individual students while 20% used them as a reflection on or guide to instruction. Twenty-five percent reported using the test scores in grouping and tracking students. She concluded her study by stating that "standardized achievement test scores provide a useful means of supplementing or confirming decisions reached by other means. But such test information does not appear to be crucial to the process of teacher decision making" (p. 634).

Wood (1982), who studied 215 third, fifth, and eighth grade teachers in a Maryland school district, found that teachers' responses suggested they felt fairly comfortable with standardized testing in the schools. According to her, most teachers referred to students' standardized test scores at least occasionally. The results were used broadly to identify schoolwide and systemwide curriculum strengths and weaknesses. The least reported use was instructional use particularly selecting materials for individuals and pacing instruction.

Herman and Dorr-Bremme (1983) surveyed a nationally representative sample of principals and teachers from 91 school districts. From their survey, teachers reported that planning teaching at the beginning of the school year, initiating grouping or placement of students, and changing a student from one group or curriculum to another, providing remedial or accelerated work constituted the main decisions made with the test results.

Ruddell (1985) drew a sample from school districts in California. Seven selected districts ranging from Southern California to the San Francisco Bay Area and rural Northern California were used. The total sample of 38 was comprised of 9 third grade teachers, 9 sixth grade teachers, 12 principals and 8 district office personnel. Interviews and a questionnaire was used to obtain the data. He reported minimal use of standardized achievement tests by teachers in making instructional decisions. The results from this study however, needs to be treated with caution because the sample size is very small.

Hall et. al (1985) followed up 184 out of 445 College of Education, University of Florida graduates on the use of standardized tests. The teachers taught K-12 grades and all subject areas. They reported that test results were used for assessing student academic progress and diagnosis of student weaknesses.

In the Green & Williams (1989) study which has been cited earlier, the top five purposes for testing given by Wyoming elementary level teachers were (1) district requirement for school comparisons (2) individual diagnosis (3) curriculum evaluation (4) assessing student growth, and (5) placement. The middle school level teachers' top five purposes were (1) district requirement for school comparisons (2) individual diagnosis (3) placement (4) assessing student growth, and (5) curriculum evaluation. At the senior

high level, the top two purposes were to assess student growth and curriculum evaluation. The purposes listed by Louisiana elementary level teachers were (1) individual diagnosis, (2) curriculum evaluation, and (3) placement. At the middle school level, the three most frequently listed purposes were placement, individual diagnosis, and school/district requirement.

In the survey conducted by Dorr-Bremme and Herman (1986) and cited earlier, teachers indicated that they used test results for diagnosis, curriculum planning, grading and reporting student progress.

Watson (1990) studied teachers, counselors and school administrators in Idaho public schools. A total of 382 regular teachers in grades 1-12, 286 full-time counselors, and 254 administrators for a total of 922 educators were invited to participate in the study. Seven hundred returned inventories, which constituted a 75.9% return rate, was analyzed. The sample consisted of 277 teachers, 211 counselors, and 212 administrators. He found that teachers used standardized tests less considerably. The tests were 'somewhat' used for instructional planning, individual evaluation, parent information and group evaluation.

In a major Arizona survey, Nolen, Haladyna and Haas (1992) mailed approximately 5,770 surveys to grades K-12 teachers and administrators across the state. One thousand one hundred and eighty-one (41.1% of total sample) of the teacher surveys and 563 (46.9% of total sample) of the administrator surveys were returned in usable condition, for a total sample of 2,444. They reported that teachers used tests scores in order of importance to (1) identify remedial students (2) identify gifted students (3)

measure class/school effectiveness (4) guide instruction (5) diagnose learning problems (6) communicate with parents (7) place students for instruction.

Green (1992) reported that a review of past practice suggests minimal use of standardized test results by teachers in making instructional decisions (Fenessey, 1982; Green & Williams, 1989; Lazar-Morrison, Polin, Moy, & Burry, 1980; Ruddell, 1985). The reasons offered for why standardized tests are given but results not always used by teachers include resistance to a perceived narrowing of the curriculum, resistance to management control, accountability avoidance (Darling-Hammond & Wise, 1985; Ruddell, 1977), failure of test publishers to report scores in a form useful to teaches (Lortie, 1975), low quality of some standardized tests (Boyd et al., 1975) the vague purpose of some standardized tests (Whitehead & Santee, 1987) and a limited understanding of score interpretation resulting from inadequate preservice training (Cramer & Slater, 1968; Gullickson & Hopkins, 1987).

School administrators

Sproull & Zubrow (1981) interviewed 58 administrators in 18 school systems in Western Pennsylvania. The administrators included those in charge of standardized testing, district office personnel who had the opportunity to use or work with tests and test scores, including superintendents, and directors of pupil personnel. They reported that "central office administrators do not perceive themselves to be primary users of test information. In their opinion, the most intensive (and significant) use of test information

occurs at the building level" (p. 630). However, they reported that the most common use of test information was for curricular evaluation.

Herman and Dorr-Bremme (1983) surveyed a nationally representative sample of principals and teachers from 91 school districts. From their survey, the principals reported that curriculum evaluation, student promotion, public communication, communication to parents, and reporting to district were the major uses for test results.

Watson (1990) mailed 254 inventories to school administrators in Idaho public schools. Two hundred and twelve inventories were returned for a return rate of 85%. He found that administrators used standardized tests for (1) instructional planning, (2) individual evaluation, (3) curricular evaluation, and (4) parent information.

In the Nolen, Haladyna and Haas (1992) study cited earlier, the 563 (46.9% return rate) administrators reported that tests scores were used to (1) identify curriculum strengths and weaknesses (2) evaluate school effectiveness.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

1. Classroom teachers' attitude toward standardized achievement tests appears to be negative. Teachers generally seem not to like the presence of standardized tests in schools. This could be due to reasons cited as resistance to a perceived narrowing of the curriculum, resistance to management control, accountability avoidance, failure of test publishers to report scores in a form useful to teaches, the vague purpose of some standardized tests, and a limited understanding of score interpretation resulting from

inadequate preservice training (Darling-Hammond & Wise, 1985; Ruddell, 1977; Cramer & Slater, 1968; Gullickson & Hopkins, 1987; Lortie, 1975; Boyd et al., 1975; Whitehead & Santee, 1987).

2. There appears to be limited research on gender and school level differences in attitudes/perceptions toward standardized tests. In the current search, only two studies attempted to investigate these differences.
3. School administrators seem to have a positive attitude towards standardized achievement tests. They favor the presence of the tests in the schools.
4. There appears to be very limited research on the attitude of school administrators toward standardized tests. The search located only two relevant studies.
5. Teachers use standardized achievement test results on a limited scale to make educational decisions. The major use is to confirm or supplement what information they already have about their students.
6. School administrators find standardized test results most useful. The major uses are for curricular evaluation, communication to parents, and evaluation of school effectiveness
7. A shift seems to have appeared from the traditional uses of standardized achievement tests results from the 'low stakes' (primarily for instructional purposes) to 'high stakes' (accountability purposes).

Recommendations

1. State-mandated tests need to be more localized. Since school objectives differ from school district to school district, standardized achievement tests will be most useful if they match local curricular objectives. However, since accountability is a major concern, state departments of education should seriously consider implementing a central state curriculum which will make inter-school comparisons more effective.
2. School administrators should not use standardized test results to assess school effectiveness. Standardized achievement test batteries assess only a limited portion of the total school curriculum. To assess the effectiveness of the school, results from other assessment instruments must be combined with the standardized test results.
3. More large scale studies addressing the perceptions and uses of standardized achievement tests by school administrators are needed. An extension of this study could be the investigation of perceptions and uses of tests by state legislators.
4. More research needs to be done on the effect of teacher attitude toward standardized achievement tests on students' performance. Soltz (1992) concluded his study by reporting that teachers' perceptions of standardized tests were not consistently related to either the effort teachers put into preparing their classes for the tests or to their students' performance. However, Urdan and Paris (1994) in a more recent study reported that teachers had generally negative perceptions of standardized tests but their willingness to "spend large amounts of time preparing their students to take tests that they do not believe are valid or educationally beneficial suggests that these

teachers are under pressure to have their students perform well on the tests, and are willing to engage in practices that artificially inflate or pollute the scores" (p. 151).

Bibliography

American Association of School Administrators. (1989). *Testing: Where we stand.* Arlington, VA: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 314 854).

American Institutes for Research. (1988). *Finding information about standardized tests.* Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 302 557).

Aiken, L. R., & Romen, L. (1984, April). *Attitudes and experiences concerning psychological and educational testing.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association, Las Vegas, NV. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 247 322.)

Anderson, B. L., et al. (1980). *Educational testing facts and issues: A layperson's guide to testing in the schools.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 196 935).

Airasian, P. W. (1979). A perspective on the uses and misuses of standardized achievement tests. *NCME Measurement in Education, 10*(3).

Airasian, P. W. (1987). State mandated testing and educational reform: Context and consequences. *American Journal of Education, 95*(3), 393-412.

Anastasi, A., & Geisinger, K. F. (1980). *Use of tests with schoolchildren. Final project report.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 194 635.)

Bauer, E. A. (1992,). NATD survey of testing practices and issues. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 11*(1), 10-14.

Baker, E. L. (1978). Is something better than nothing? Metaphysical test design. In J. L. Herman & D. W. Dorr-Bremme (1983), Uses of testing in the schools: A national profile. *New Directions for Testing and Measurement (Testing in the Schools), 19*, 7-17.

Baker, E. L. (1982). *Issues in achievement testing.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 228 277.)

Baker, E. L. (1988). *Mandated tests: Reform or quality indicator?* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 341 733.)

Barton, P. E. (1994). *Testing in America's schools.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Bassler, O. C. & Caulkins, T. G. (1984). *Using test results to improve instruction.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 240 139.)

Beck, M. D. & Stetz, F. P. (1979, April). *Teachers' opinions of standardized test use and usefulness.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 177 202).

Beck, M. D. & Stetz, F. P. (1980, April). *Standardized testing as viewed by test specialists and users.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 191 876).

Beck, M. D. (1980). *Student and Teacher Attitudes Toward Standardized Tests: A Summary of Two Surveys.* Paper presented at the National Institute of Education Invitational Conference on Test Use. Washington, DC.

Beck, M. D. (1981, April). *Uses and misuses of standardized test scores on a local level: A test developer's perspective.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 204 380).

Bhaerman, R. D. (1977). What do teachers think about testing? *American Educator, 1*(1), 10-14.

Bligh, H. F. (1979, April). *Achievement testing--A look at trends.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 177 221.)

Bossone, R. M. & Weiner, M. (Eds.). (1977, November). *Proceedings. The National Conference on Testing: Major issues.* New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 152 825.)

Boyd, J. et al. (1975). *A study of testing practices in the Royal Oak (Michigan) public schools.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 117 161).

Bradford, J. W. (1990). *A meta-analysis of selected research on student attitudes toward mathematics.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Braun, C. (1975, November). *The standardized test: Uses and abuses.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Transmountain Regional Conference of the International Reading Association, Calgary, Alberta. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 116 149).

Brophy, J. (1982). *An assessment of the attitudes and knowledge of teachers, counselors and administrators in the commonwealth of Massachusetts toward norm-referenced standardized testing: Implications for educational decision-making.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northeastern, University, Boston.

Brown, L. B. (1976). What teachers should know about standardized tests. *Social Education, 40*(7), 509-516.

Business Council for Effective Literacy. (1990). *Standardized tests: Their use & misuse.* New York, NY: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 314 636.)

Burry, J. et al. (1981, April). *Teaching and testing: Allies or adversaries.* Papers presented at a symposium at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 218 337).

Carifio, J. & Kermis, W. (1990, February). *Some findings on preparing teachers' attitudes towards tests.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Tampa, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 317 553).

Carpenter, B. (1982, April). *What boards should know about standardized testing.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National School Boards Association, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 223 655.)

Caswell, M. S. & Roeber, E. D. (1982). Reporting *test results to the school board. using and reporting test results.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 246 119).

Coffman, W. E. (1980). *Those Achievement Tests--How Useful?* Address delivered at a testing conference sponsored by the Midcontinent Regional Educational Laboratory and the Regional Offices of Educational Programs VII and VIII (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 209 762).

Cormany, R. B. (1974). Faculty attitudes toward standardized testing. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 7,* 188-194.

Costello, S. & Weiss, D. (1984). *A summary of guidelines for test users.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 250 318).

Cramer, S. & Slater, M. (1968). A scale to assess attitudes toward aptitude testing. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 1*(2).

UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation. (1990). *Test use in schools.* Los Angeles, CA: Author.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Wise, A. E. (1985). Beyond standardization: State standards and school improvement. *Elementary School Journal, 85*, 313-336.

Dorr-Bremme, D. W. & Herman, J. L. (1986). *Assessing student achievement: A profile of classroom practices,* (CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation No. 11). Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Dreher, M. J. & Singer, H. (1984). Making Standardized Tests Work for You. *Principal, 63*(4), 20-24.

Duran, R. P. (1985, April). *Testing in the schools: Scientific challenges to practice and policy implications.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 269 468).

Ebel, R. L. (1977). The uses of standardized testing.. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 142 567).

Ebel, R. L. (1979). Using tests to improve learning. *Arithmetic Teacher, 27*(3), 10-12.

Ebel, R. L. (1981). The social consequences of not testing. *New Directions for Testing and Measurement, 9*, 31-37.

Ebel, R. L. & Frisbie, D. A. (1991). *Essentials of Educational Measurement.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Edelman, J. (1981). The impact of the mandated testing program on classroom practices: Teacher perspectives. *Education, 102*(1), 56-59.

Educational Testing Service. (1989, October). *The uses of standardized tests in American education.* Proceedings of the 1989 ETS invitational conference, New York , NY.

Elliott, O. (1991). The uses of tests. *American School Board Journal, 178*(2), 33-34.

Fitzgibbon, T. J. (1975, April). Dear mama: Why don't they love me anymore? Speech given before the National Council on Measurement in Education' San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 129 909).

Foos, P. W. & Fisher, R. P. (1988). Using tests as learning opportunities. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(2), 179-83.

Forsyth, R. A. et al. (1972). *Perceptions of Iowa Teachers Related to the Use of ITED Results by Administrators and Counselors.* Iowa Testing Programs Research Report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 078 054).

Frary, R. B. (1982). Social consequences of not testing. *New Directions for Testing and Measurement (Academic Testing and the Consumer, 16,* 147-52.

Gardner, E. F. (1985, April). *How can tests be misused: let me count the ways.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 262 045).

Goslin, D. A. (1967). *Teachers and testing.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Green, K. E. & Stager, S. F. (1985). *Teachers' Attitudes toward Testing.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, Chicago, Ill, April 1985.

Green, D. R. (1986). *Interpreting Scores from Standardized Achievement Tests.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 300 451)

Green, K. E. & Stager, S. F. (1986). Measuring attitudes of teachers toward testing. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 19,* 141-150.

Green, K. E. (1990, April). *Differences between teachers and students in opinions about testing and test use.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, Boston, MA.

Green, K. E. (1992). Differing opinions on testing between preservice and inservice teachers. *Journal of Educational Research, 86*(1), 37-42.

Green, K. E. & Stager, S. F. (1987). Testing, Coursework, Attitudes, and Practices. *Educational Research Quarterly, 11*(2), 48-55.

Green, K. E. & Williams, E. J. (1989, March). *Standardized test use by classroom teachers: Effects of training and grade level taught.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 306 252).

Griswold, P. A. (1988). *Teachers' Attitudes toward testing: Recommendations for district policy and staff development. An occasional report to the superintendent.* Parkrose Public Schools, Portland, Oregon. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 305 363).

Gronlund, N. E. (1981). *Measurement and evaluation in teaching.* New York: Macmillan.

Gullickson, A. R. (1982). *The practice of testing in elementary and secondary schools.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 229 391).

Gullickson, A. R. (1984). Teacher perspectives of their instructional use of tests. *Journal of Educational Research, 77*(4), 244-248.

Gullickson, A. R. & Hopkins, K. D. (1987). The context of educational measurement instruction for preservice teachers: Professor perspectives. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 6*(3), 12-16.

Haag, C. H. (1978). *The uses and abuses of standardized testing.* Paper presented at the summer convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Minneapolis, MN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 166 217.)

Hall, B. W. et al. (1985). How beginning teachers use test results in critical education decisions. *Educational Research Quarterly, 9*(3), 12-18.

Hall, B. W. et al. (1988). Test use among classroom teachers and its relationship to teaching level and teaching practices. *Applied Measurement in Education, 1*(2), 145-56.

Harvey, D. (1980). Standardized testing: A prejudiced view. *School Guidance Worker, 35*(4), 12-17.

Herman, J. L. & Dorr-Bremme, D. W. (1983). Uses of testing in the schools: A national profile. *New Directions for Testing and Measurement (Testing in the Schools), 19*, 7-17.

Herman, J. et al. (1990). *The effects of testing on teaching and learning.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 352 382).

Herman, J. L. & Golan, S. (1993). The effects of standardized testing on teaching and schools. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 12*(4), 20-25, 41-42.

Herman, J. L. et al. (1994). Assessing the Effects of Standardized Testing on Schools. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54*(2), 471-82.

Haney, W. & Madaus, G. (1986). *Effects of Standardized Testing and the Future of the National Assessment of Educational Progress.* Working Paper for the NAEP Study Group. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 279 680).

Hathaway, W. E. (Ed.). (1983). *Testing in the schools.* New directions for testing and measurement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Hedges, L. V. & Olkin, I. (1985). *Statistical methods for meta-analysis.* New York: Academic Press.

Higgins, J. E. et al. (1982). *Using measurement and evaluation to promote learning.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 220 511).

Hodgkinson, H. L. (1982). The School Administrator and Standardized Testing. *NASSP Bulletin, 66*(457), 21-27.

Impara, J. C. et al. (1993). Teachers' assessment background and attitudes toward testing. *Theory into Practice, 32*(2), 113-17.

Jaeger, R. M. (1981). *On the use of standardized achievement tests in follow through program evaluation.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 244 730).

James, J. C. & Tanner, C. K. (1993). Standardized Testing of Young Children. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 26*(3), 143-52.

Joselyn, E. G. (1975). An introduction to standardized testing for teachers and administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 117 197).

Karmos, A. H. & Karmos, J. S. (1984). Attitudes toward standardized achievement tests and their relation to achievement test performance. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 17*(2), 56-66.

Kean, M. H. (1986, April). *Testing and the curriculum: A publisher's perspective.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 275 724).

Kennedy, E. G. et al. (1972). *Position paper on standardized testing.* Kansas Advisory Council for Guidance and Pupil Personnel Services, Topeka, KS. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 066 445).

Lambert, R. F. (1981). Teacher attitudes on testing: A multiple perspective. *The College Board Review, 118*, 14-30.

Lazar-Morrison, C. et al. (1980). *A review of the literature on test use.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 204 411).

Levine, M. (1976). The academic achievement test: Its historical context and social functions. *American Psychologist, 31*, 228-238.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). School-teacher: a sociological study. In K. E. Green, & E. J. Williams, (1989, March). *Standardized test use by classroom teachers: Effects of training and grade level taught.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 306 252).

Lown, D. E. (1974). Standardized tests: A handbook for administration and use. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 095 212).

Lum, J. B. (1987, April). *K-12 Standardized achievement and aptitude testing: The end users.* Testimony presented at the annual conference of the National Association of Asian and Pacific American Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 301 599).

Madaus, G. F. & Tan, A. G. (1993). The growth of assessment. In G. Cawelti (Ed.), *Challenges and achievements of American education* (pp. 53-79). Alexandria, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 353 261).

Marks, D. (1984). Statewide achievement testing: A brief history. *Educational Research Quarterly, 13*(3), 36-43.

Marso, R. N. & Pigge, F. L. (1991, April). *Testing directors', principals', supervisors', and teachers' perceptions of the actual purposes of school standardized testing programs.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council in Measurement in Education, Chicago, IL.

Marso, R. N. & Pigge, F. L. (1992, February). *Classroom teachers' perceptions of the extent and effectiveness of their schools' uses of standardized test results.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Orlando, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 342 802).

Mehrens, W. A. & Lehmann, I. J. (1984). *Measurement and evaluation in education and psychology.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Mehrens, W. A. & Green, D. R. (1986). *Standardized tests and school curricula.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 322 150).

Merwin, J. C. (1979, April). *An author's perspective of standardized achievement tests.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 177 195).

Merwin, J. C. (1982). Standardized tests: One tool for decision making in the classroom. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 1*(1), 14-16.

Moore, W. P. (1994). The Devaluation of Standardized Testing: One district's response to a mandated assessment. *Applied Measurement in Education, 7(4),* 343-67.

Morris, J. (Ed.). (1983). Educational Testing. *School Guidance Worker, 38*(4), 5-59.

National Council of Teachers of English. (1974). *Uses, abuses, misuses of standardized tests in English.* Urbana, Ill. Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 090 562).

Neill, D. M. & Medina, N. J. (1989). Standardized testing: Harmful to educational health. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70*(9), 688-97.

Noggle, N. L. (1991). *The misuse of educational achievement tests for grades K-12: A perspective.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 340 779).

Nolen, S. B., Haladyna, T. M., & Haas, N. S. (1992). Uses and abuses of achievement test scores. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 11*(2), 9-15.

Oberlin, L. (1982, April). *What standardized achievement tests do and do not tell the teacher of elementary and junior high science--The implications for teacher education.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Science Teachers Association in Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 219 282).

Odden, A. (1986). Sources of funding for educational reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67*(5), 335-40.

Office of Technology Assessment. (1992). *Testing in American schools.* Washington, DC: Author.

Paris, S. G. et al. (1991). A developmental perspective on standardized achievement testing. *Educational Researcher, 20*(5), 12-20.

Paris, S. G. (1992). Four perspectives on educational assessment. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 39*(2), 95-105.

Perkins, K. et al. (1986). *The use of achievement test results in elementary school guidance and counseling.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 299 483).

Perrone, V. (1976). On Standardized Testing and Evaluation *Childhood Education, 53*(1), 10-16.

Perrone, V. (1977). *The abuses of standardized testing.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 141 399).

Perrone, V. (1978). Remarks to the National Conference on Achievement Testing and Basic Skills. In J. L. Herman & D. W. Dorr-Bremme (1983), Uses of testing in the schools: A national profile. *New Directions for Testing and Measurement (Testing in the Schools), 19*, 7-17.

Perrone, V. (1991). On standardized testing. *Childhood Education, 67*(3), 131-42.

Pigge, F. L. & Marso, R. N. (1993, October). *A summary of published research: Classroom teachers' and educators' attitudes toward and support of teacher-made testing.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Educational Research Association, Chicago, Ill.

Plake, B. S. & Impara, J. C, (1993, April). *Teacher assessment literacy: Development of training modules.* Report on an NCME-Based Kellogg Foundation Grant. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education Atlanta, GA.

Popham, W. J. (1978). The standardized test flap flop. *Phi Delta Kappan, 59*(7), 470-1.

Porter, A. C. (1983). The role of testing in effective schools. *American Education, 19*(1), 25-28.

Puleo, V. T. & Lieberman, B. E. (1986). *Maximizing the use of standardized test results: A brief case study.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 219 801).

Ruddell, R. B. (1985). Knowledge and attitudes toward testing: Field educators and legislators. *Reading Teacher, 38*(6), 538-543.

Rudman, H. C. (1977). The standardized test flap. *Phi Delta Kappan, 59*(3), 179-185.

Rudman, H. C. (1993). National testing or political testing: Is there a difference? *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 12*(3), 5-9, 30.

Rudner, L. M. & Dorko, K. (1985). Even 57 years ago, school people debated the uses and misuses of tests. *American School Board Journal, 172*(1), 49.

Rudner, L. M. et al. (1990). The ERIC clearinghouse on tests, measurement, and evaluation --A Growing resource. *Applied Measurement in Education, 4*(1), 1-10.

Rudner, L. M. (Ed.). (1983, June). Testing in our schools. Proceedings of the NIE Invitational Conference on Test Use, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 237 579).

Rudner, L. M., (Ed.). (1989). *Understanding achievement tests: A guide for school administrators.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 314 426).

Ryor, J. (1978, March). *Teachers and achievement testing.* Paper presented at the national conference on Achievement Testing and Basic Skills, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 151 355).

Salmon-Cox, L. (1981). Teachers and standardized achievement tests: What's really happening? *Phi Delta Kappan, 62*(9), 631-34.

Sax, G. (1974). *The use of standardized tests in evaluation.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 123 235).

Schneider, E. J. (1978). *Researcher questions use of standardized test results.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 237 582).

Serow, R. C. & Jackson, H. L. (1991). Using standardized test data to measure school effectiveness. *NASSP Bulletin, 67*(465), 20-25.

Shepard, L. A.& Dougherty, K. C. (1991, April). *Effects of high-stakes testing on instruction.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 337 468).

Smith, M. L. et al. (1991). *The role of testing in elementary schools.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 338 673).

Soltz, D. F. (1992, April). *Does it really matter what teachers think of tests? mandated testing in two "low stakes" school districts.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 344 901).

Sontag, M. (1967). *Attitudes toward education and perception of desirable teacher behaviors--A q study.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 011 881).

Sproull, L. & Zubrow, D. (1981). Standardized testing from the administrative perspective. *Phi Delta Kappan, 62*(9), 628-631.

Stetz, F. P. & Beck, M. D. (1979). Comments from the classroom: Teachers' and students' opinions of achievement tests. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 171 779).

Stiggins, R. J. (1985). Improving assessment where it means the most: In the classroom. *Educational Leadership, 43*(2), 69-74.

Swain, C. L. (1982). Using test data effectively. *New Directions for Testing and Measurement (Academic Testing and the Consumer), 16,* 77-86.

Takeuchi, R. T. (1977). *Attitudes of elementary teachers toward testing: Use and abuse of standardized tests in California, 1976-1977.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Thorndike, R. L. (1969). *Measurement in education: Helping teachers use tests.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 051 295).

Tumin, M. M. (1981). The functions of testing. *New Directions for Testing and Measurement, 9,* 21-29.

Travers, Eugene J. (1979). *Some uses of standardized test results. Director's handbook.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 194 598.)

Urdan, T. C. & Paris, S. G. (1994). Teachers' Perceptions of Standardized Achievement Tests. *Educational Policy, 8*(2), 137-156.

Ward, J. G. & Gould, J. C. (1980). *Plain talk about standardized tests. Research report.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 206 721).

Ward, J. G. (1980). The news on testing: The good, the bad, and the useful. *American Educator, 4*(3), 24-27.

Ward. J. G. (1980). *Teachers and testing: A survey of knowledge and attitudes.* American Federation of Teachers: Washington, DC.

Watson, L. E. (1990). *Educator perceptions of standardized achievement test uses and practices in the public schools of Idaho.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Idaho.

Weber, G. (1974). *Uses and Abuses of Standardized Testing in the Schools.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 094 098).

Whitehead, B. & Santee, P. (1987). Using standardized test results as an instructional guide. *Clearing House, 61,* 57-59.

Whitehead, B. & Santee, P. (1994). Using standardized test results as an instructional guide. *Clearing House, 67*(6), 320-22.

Wick, J. W. (1986). Should you be leery of claims about standardized testing? *School Administrator, 43(11),* 10-11.

Wigdor, A. K., & Garner, W. R. (Eds.). (1982). Ability testing: Uses, consequences, and controversies. Part I: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 213 770).

Wigdor, A. K., & Garner, W. R. (Eds.). (1982). Ability testing: Uses, consequences, and controversies. Part II: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 213 771).

Wigdor, A. K. (1982). Ability measurement: Uses, consequences, and controversies. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 1*(3), 6-8, 26.

Wilson, S. M. & Hiscox, M. D. (1984). Using standardized tests for assessing local learning objectives. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 3*(3) 19-22.

Wolok, R. S. (1972). Let's use tests for teaching - Standardized test results can provide the basis for a program of instruction. *Teacher, 90*(2), 62-4, 179-81.

Wood, C. M. (1982). *The role of standardized achievement tests in the management of instruction: A survey of teacher and administrator practices and attitudes.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 219 446).

Worthen, B. R. & Spandel, V. (1991). Putting the standardized test debate in perspective. *Educational Leadership, 48*(5), 65-69.

Yeh, J. P. (1978). *Test use in schools. Studies in measurement and methodology.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 214 951).

Yeh, J. P. (1980). *A reanalysis of test use data. Test use project.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 205 590).

Yeh, J. P. et al. (1981). *Teachers and Testing: A survey of test use.* National Institute of Education: Washington, DC.